

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the Application. In previous responses, the Applicants canceled dependent Claims 6 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer and added dependent Claims 21-22. In the present response, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 in order to correct typographical errors pointed out by the Examiner. No other claims have been amended, canceled, or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-22 are currently pending in the Application.

**I. Formal Matters and Objections**

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 as containing informalities. In response, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to correct these inadvertent errors and appreciate the Examiner's diligence in finding and bringing these errors to their attention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Claim 1 and allow issuance thereof.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the Examiner states that he can not find support in the original specification that ties the user to be able to use the specific contact database to make a call easier. (See Examiner's Action of November 26, 2008, pages 2-3.) The Applicants respectfully disagree and maintain that the use of the specific contact database does indeed make a call by the user easier.

As stated in paragraph [0015] of the original specification, if the user of mobile phone 100 wants to provide contact data 201 of business card 200 to a specific contact database of the mobile telephone 100, a picture of the contact data 201 is recorded and then transmitted via air link to a processing server 400 that processes the transmitted image and extract the contact data 201 from the image of the business card 201 by recognizing the contact data 201 in the image. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would understand that the contact data of the business card would include, *inter alia*, a phone number of the person imprinted on the business card (in addition the company name, address, e-mail, *etc.*). Once the contact information is extracted by the processing server, it is sent back to the mobile telephone and stored in a specific contact database in the mobile telephone. Once the data, specifically the contact person's telephone number, is stored in the specific contact database of the mobile telephone, the user can then access that data from the contact database to easily dial the contact's telephone number as with any other telephone number in the specific contact database of the telephone. By adding the extracted contact data to the specific contact database of the mobile telephone, the user of the mobile telephone does not have to memorize or write down the contact telephone number, or keep the business card that had the contact data imprinted thereon to be able to make a call to the contact telephone number.

As such, Claims 1 and 11 are supported by the original specification as established above and, as a result comply with the requirements of § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the § 112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 1 and 11 and allow issuance thereof.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 14-15, 18, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 14-15, 18, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0087650 by Aarnio (hereinafter “Aarnio”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,266,186 to Henderson (hereinafter “Henderson”). The Applicants respectfully disagree since the cited portions of Aarnio and Henderson do not teach or suggest processing an image to extract contact data from the image and storing the contact data in a specific contact database of a mobile telephone as recited in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Citing paragraphs [0006], [0016], and [0023], it appears the Examiner is equating the digital image of: (1) a geographic location surrounding a mobile station (paragraph [0006]); (2) a geographic location proximate the mobile station such as a building, an intersection with a street sign, a landmark, *etc.* (paragraph [0016]); or (3) a retail outlet (paragraph [0023] with the claimed image from which contact data is extracted. (*See* Examiner's Action of November 26, 2008, pages 3-5.). The cited portions of Aarnio teach that once the digital image of the geographic location surrounding a mobile station is sent to a conversion and location server, stored geographic location information, typically a library of regional street maps and landmarks is transmitted back to the mobile station. (*See, e.g.*, paragraph [0006] of Aarnio.) Additionally, the cited portions of Aarnio teach that once the digital image of the building, intersection, landmark, *etc.* proximate the mobile station is sent to mobile network 14 along with a request to identify the exact mobile station location, location server 22 sends location information in the form of a text message or diagram (*e.g.*, map) displayed on a display incorporated in the mobile station, or in the form of an audible message

broadcast from a mobile phone. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0016]-[0018] of Aarnio.) Furthermore, the cited portions of Aarnio teach that once a digital image of a retail outlet is sent to system 10, a service server will information concerning special offers or sales pertaining to the retail outlet can be provided to a mobile station user. (See, e.g., paragraph [0023] of Aarnio.)

Thus, the cited portions of Aarnio teach processing an image to extract: a library of regional street maps and landmarks; location information in the form of a text message or diagram to be displayed on a mobile station or in the form of an audible message; and information concerning special offers or sales pertaining to a retail outlet. The Applicants fail to find where the cited portions of Aarnio teach extracting contact data. While the Examiner cites paragraphs [0006]-[0008], [0016]-[0018], and [0023] of Aarnio to assert that the extracted contact data can easily be added to a specific contact database (see Examiner's Action of November 26, 2008, pages 4-5), the Applicants fail to find where the extracted information of the cited portions of Aarnio is stored in a specific contact database of a mobile telephone. As such, the cited portions of Aarnio do not teach or suggest processing an image to extract contact data from the image and storing the contact data in a specific contact database of a mobile telephone as recited in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Henderson has not been cited to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Aarnio but to teach that extracted contact data can be easily added to a specific contact database. (See Examiner's Action of November 26, 2008, page 4.) As such, the cited portions of the cited combination of Aarnio and Henderson, as applied by the Examiner, do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claims 1 and 11 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants

respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 14-15, 18, and 21-22 and allow issuance thereof.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 2-3, 7, 9-10, 12-13, 17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-3, 7, 9-10, 12-13, 17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aarnio in view of Henderson and further in view of: U.S. Patent No. 6,956,833 to Yukie, *et al.* (hereinafter “Yukie”) for Claims 2, 7, 9, 12, 17, and 19; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0211856 by Zilliacus (hereinafter “Zilliacus”) for Claims 3 and 13; and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0181200 by Iida (hereinafter “Iida”) for Claims 10 and 20. As established above, the cited portions of the cited combination of Aarnio and Henderson, as applied by the Examiner, do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claims 1 and 11. Yukie, Zilliacus, and Iida have not been cited to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited portions of Aarnio and Henderson but to teach the subject matter of the above-mentioned dependent claims. As such, the cited portions of Aarnio and Henderson in combination with Yukie, Zilliacus, or Iida fails to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness for independent Claims 1 and 11 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 2-3, 7, 9-10, 12-13, 17, and 19-20 and allow issuance thereof.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this Application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-22.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

**HITT GAINES, PC**



Steven J. Hanke  
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: February 26, 2009

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800